

REMARKS

Claims 8-15 are pending and have been examined. Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and claims 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I. Preliminary Matters

The Examiner has not indicated whether the drawings filed on March 2, 2004, are acceptable. In addition, the Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to check the appropriate boxes on the Office Action Summary in a subsequent Office Action.

Further, the Examiner has objected to claim 8 due to minor informalities. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 8 in a manner believed to overcome the objection.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,009,831 to Turi (“Turi”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Turi.

A. Claim 8

Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 8 recites a gas jet nozzle for jetting a gas toward the surface of the cooling roller and forming a

gas curtain extending in a width direction of the surface of the cooling roller, between the cooling roller and the gas jet nozzle. Further, the gas jet nozzle is provided near a nip point for the support and the resin film.

Applicant submits that Turi fails to teach or suggest the above feature. For example, the gas jets 30 and 32 of Turi jet gas directly onto the resin film 22, rather than onto the cooling roller 10. Further, Turi fails to disclose the formation of a “gas curtain” extending in a width direction of the surface of the cooling roller and between the cooling roller and the gas jet nozzles. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference.

B. Claim 9

Claim 9 recites that the flow velocity of the blown gas is 1m/sec or higher. The Examiner maintains that the gas jet of Turi is “capable” of blowing gas at the claimed speed. Such rejection does not provide proper anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Turi simply does not teach the claimed velocity, and therefore, does not anticipate claim 9. Also, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 8.

III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,917,844 to Komai et al. (“Komai”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Komai.

A. Claim 8

Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 8 recites a gas jet nozzle for jetting a gas toward the surface of the cooling roller and forming a gas curtain extending in a width direction of the surface of the cooling roller, between the cooling roller and the gas jet nozzle. Further, the gas jet nozzle is provided near a nip point for the support and the resin film.

Applicant submits that Komai fails to teach or suggest the above feature. For example, Komai fails to teach or suggest that the alleged gas jet nozzle 8 forms a “gas curtain” extending in a width direction of the surface of the alleged cooling roller 6, and between the alleged cooling roller 6 and the alleged gas jet nozzle 8. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference.

B. Claim 9

The Examiner cites to the example on lines 33-42 of column 3 regarding a velocity of the gas. However, the cited portion does not disclose the claimed velocity. Therefore, claim 9 is not “anticipated” by Komai. In addition, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 8.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,470,055 to Wade (“Wade”)

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Wade.

A. Claim 8

Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference. For example, claim 8 recites a gas jet nozzle for jetting a gas toward the surface of the cooling roller and forming a gas curtain extending in a width direction of the surface of the cooling roller, between the cooling roller and the gas jet nozzle. Further, the gas jet nozzle is provided near a nip point for the support and the resin film.

Applicant submits that Wade fails to teach or suggest the above feature. For example, Wade fails to teach or suggest that the alleged gas jet nozzle 25 forms a “gas curtain” extending in a width direction of the surface of the alleged cooling roller 6, and between the alleged cooling roller 6 and the alleged gas jet nozzle 25. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference.

B. Claim 9

Since Wade fails to teach or suggest the claimed gas velocity, Applicant submits that claim 9 is not “anticipated” by Wade. In addition, Applicant submits that claim 9 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 8.

V. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Wade

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wade.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has omitted to cite claims 12-15 in the current rejections. Since claims 13 and 15 recite analogous subject matter as claims 9 and 11, and claim 14 recites analogous subject matter as claim 10, Applicant has included the claims below. However, the Examiner has not discussed the features of claim 12.

A. Claims 9, 11, 13 and 15

Since claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 are dependent upon claim 8, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. In view of MPEP §2143, Applicant requests the Examiner to cite to a reference that discloses the claimed feature if the rejection of claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 are to be maintained.

B. Claims 10 and 14

Applicant submits that claims 10 and 14 are patentable over the cited reference at least by virtue of their dependency upon claim 8.

In addition, Wade discloses that the steam knife 25 is positioned in “close proximity” to the chill roll 6. There is no disclosure that the steam knife 25 is positioned 50 mm or less from the cooling roller, as recited in the claims. In this regard, Applicant refers the Examiner to the non-limiting embodiment on page 11 of the current Application, which discloses that the distance of 50 mm or less is determined to avoid diffusion of the blown gas and to provide a stable gas curtain.

Applicant requests the Examiner to cite to a reference in support of her position if the rejection is to be maintained.

C. Claim 12

As stated above, the Examiner has not provided a clear rejection for claim 12. Applicant submits that Wade fails to teach or suggest the claimed angle. Rather, the central angle of Wade is greater than 90°. Further, Applicant submits that claim 12 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency upon claim 8.

VI. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Komai and Wade

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Komai in view of Wade.

A. Claims 9, 11, 13 and 15

Since claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 are dependent upon claim 8, and neither Komai nor Wade teach or suggest the features of claim 8 discussed above, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. In view of MPEP §2143, Applicant requests the Examiner to cite to a reference that discloses the claimed feature if the rejection of claims 9, 11, 13 and 15 are to be maintained.

B. Claims 10 and 14

Applicant submits that claims 10 and 14 are patentable over the cited reference at least by virtue of their dependency upon claim 8.

In addition, Wade discloses that the steam knife 25 is positioned in “close proximity” to the chill roll 6. There is no disclosure that the steam knife 25 is positioned 50 mm or less from the cooling roller, as recited in the claims. Komai fails to cure this deficient teaching of Wade. Applicant refers the Examiner to the non-limiting embodiment on page 11 of the current Application, which discloses that the distance of 50 mm or less is determined to avoid diffusion of the blown gas and to provide a stable gas curtain.

Applicant requests the Examiner to cite to a reference in support of her position if the rejection is to be maintained.

C. Claim 12

Since claim 12 is dependent upon claim 8, and neither Wade nor Komai teach or suggest the features of claim 8 discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 12 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino

Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 16, 2006